

REMARKS

The interview with examiner Hanh V. Tran on 06 December 2006 is acknowledged with appreciation. The examiner's interview summary is accurate as to what transpired at the interview.

The office action rejects claims 1-17 and 20-23 over Brock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,948,691) in view of Lauchner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,796,625). Claims 18-19 and 26-27 are rejected over Brock in view of Lauchner et al. and Cheng (U.S. Patent No. 6,588,866). Claims 24-25 and 28-30 are rejected over Brock, Lauchner et al., Cheng and Klakovich (U.S. Patent No. 3,133,768).

Each of the above-noted rejections rely on modification of Brock et al. "by providing the arm of the post retainer formed to include a retention aperture for the purpose of providing a secured engagement between the mounting post 21 and the post retainer, as taught by Lauchner et al." (e.g., office action at page 4, lines 8-11).

This proposed modification of Brock et al. is not operable for at least the following reasons. In Brock et al.'s locking position the top flat face of the head portion 255 defines a plane which plane faces an inside surface of the lock arm. Assuming a hole in the lock arm 256 as suggested by the above-noted discussion in the office action, when the lock arm 256 is in the locked position the top flat face of the head portion 255 would be in the same plane and would not enter into or extend through the hole and there would be no locking of the head by the hole. That is there would be no "slot-closing position receiving the mounting post in the retention aperture" as recited in independent claim 1 and no "slot-closing position adapted to retain at the same time the mounting post in the slot and the retention aperture" as recited in independent claims 18, 20 and 23.

Stated differently, Brock et al.'s mounting pin 252 has a head portion 255 (as best seen in Figs. 16 and 17) that does not extend far enough past the surface of portion 14 of the slide 10 such that it could extend into a hole in lock arm 256 even if such hole were provided as suggested by the above-quoted proposed modification. As seen in Fig. 17 of Brock et al. the surface of head 255 is flush with the surface of portion 14 of the slide 10. That is, the head 255 extends **up to** the lock arm 256 when the lock arm 256 is in the locked position. The right hand portion of Fig. 16 in Brock et al. shows the open end of slot 254 (which has a T-shaped configuration) and just to the left of this end a head portion 255 (in phantom) is shown with the

flat disc-shaped portion in the slot. All of the flat disc-shaped head portions 255 (four head portions 255 are shown in Figs. 14, 15 and 18) extend the same distance from the chassis 250 which means **no flat disc-shaped head portion 255 could extend into or through a hole in the lock arm** even if one were provided. Thus, even if the lock arm 256 had a hole rather than a raised portion 263 as suggested by the office action the flat disc-shaped head portion 255 would not go into and through the hole and the arm would not be operable to lock the flat disc-shaped head portion. For at least these reasons, it would not have been obvious to provide a hole in the lock arm in Brock et al and even if a hole were provided it would not be operable to lock the head portion 255 since the head portion 255 would not extend into and through the hole.

Each of the rejections of the claims relies on the combination of Brock et al and Lauchner and each of the rejections is avoided on this same basis as noted above with respect to the combination of Brock et al and Lauchner.

New dependent claim 31 is submitted herewith.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims (Nos. 1-31) are in condition for allowance and such action is, respectfully, requested.

If there is any issue remaining to be resolved, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that resolution can be promptly effected.

Please charge the fee for the additional dependent claim to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435 (3467-72965).

It is requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response with the fee for such extensions and shortages in other fees, being charged, or any overpayment in fees being credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435 (3467-72965).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP



Richard B. Lazarus

Reg. No. 48,215

Tel. No. (202) 371-6348